## REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 14-16 and 20 have been cancelled, claims 4-13, 17-19, and 20-23 have been amended, and claims 24-26 have been added. Thus, claims 4-13, 17-19, and 20-26 are now active in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

Initially, it is noted that, although the Examiner presented an objection to claims 1 and 21-23 and a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, to claims 1 and 3-23, the Examiner rejected only claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 on the basis of prior art. Accordingly, in order to expedite allowance of this application, in addition to addressing all of the Examiner's concern raised in the objection and rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, applicant has cancelled claims 1, 3, 14-16 and 20, leaving only claims 21-23 as the independent claims, and amended all of the dependent claims so as to depend from one of the independent claims 21-23. Since the independent claims 21-23 were not rejected on the basis of prior art, and because the objection and rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, have been addressed (as discussed below), it is submitted that this application is now clearly in condition for allowance.

With regard to the objection to claims 1 and 21-23 near the top of page 2 of the Office Action, the independent claims 21-23 have been amended to recite "wherein said plurality of biological information sensor modules includes at least a first biological information sensor module and a second biological information sensor module,", and the later recitation of "the biological information sensor module" has been changed to --the first biological information sensor module,-- and the later recitation of "the other biological information sensor module" has been changed to --said second biological information sensor module--. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's concern presented in the objection to claims 21-23 has been obviated.

Next, in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as presented at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner noted that the language "determination means for performing determination of abnormality ..." clearly invokes 35 U.S.C.

112, sixth paragraph, meaning that the applicant has relied on the specification to interpret the structure that is directed to that "means,", and the Examiner has also noted that at page 8, line 25, the "measurement calculating unit" associated with the "determination means" is unclear as to whether the "measurement calculating unit" is structure, an algorithm or software. The Examiner further asserted that, if the determination means is an algorithm or software, then the terms/limitations will not be given patentable weight because it lacks structure that would be attributed to the apparatus claims.

Without addressing the merits of this latter assertion, it is noted that each of claims 21-23 has been amended by changing "determination means for performing determination of" to --measurement calculating unit configured to determine--. Regarding the nature of the "measurement calculating unit", it is noted that, at lines 24-27 of page 8 of the original specification (lines 6-9 of page 9 of the substitute specification filed December 26, 2007), it is disclosed that

> *"[O]n the main board 4 put on the sensor board 5, there are* ***mounted*** *a main integrated circuit 20 including a measurement calculating unit (determination means), a control unit (CPU) and a memory (data storing means), a radio communication integrated circuit 21, and a vibrator 22 serving as warning means (emphasis added)."*

It is submitted that, based at least on this disclosure, a person having ordinary skill in the art would clearly have understood the measurement calculating unit as being a structural element in view of the disclosure that the measuring calculating unit is "mounted" on the main board 4. For these reasons, it is believed apparent that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been obviated.

Thus, for the above reasons, it is believed apparent that the informalities noted by the Examiner in the objection near the top of page 2 of the Office Action have been overcome, and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has also clearly been obviated. As such, and because no prior art rejections were presented against independent claims 21-23, it is

submitted that claims 21-23, as well as the claims depending therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Noritada KATAYAMA

By: _____

Charles R. Watts
Registration No. 33,142
Attorney for Applicant

CRW/asd
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 9, 2008